DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 971 EC 212 269

AUTHOR Jones, Joan
TITLE Policies, Guidelines, and Services for the Developmentally Disabled Student at Oxnard College.
PUB DATE Aug 88
NOTE 108p.; Ph.D. Research Project, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Community Colleges; Delivery Systems; *Developmental Disabilities; Eligibility; Needs Assessment; Special Programs; Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

The study examined policies of the California community colleges concerned with serving the developmentally disabled adult; identified programs and related services offered to this population at the community colleges; and determined eligibility criteria for these programs. It also developed policies, guidelines, educational services, and related services for the developmentally disabled learner at Oxnard college as well as a plan for implementing and evaluating this program. A mail-in questionnaire and telephone interviews were used to collect data. Findings revealed that: (1) 25% of the 106 California community colleges had established on-campus programs for students with developmental disabilities; (2) mandatory assessment and program placement were provided in over 70% of the colleges for this population; (3) the most widely utilized services were special classes, counseling, and physical education; (4) the range in student enrollment was from 13 students to over 1,200 students. The study concluded that programs for students with developmental disabilities on the California college campuses are relatively rare, that not all of the colleges perceive a need to offer services to these students; that special education personnel have not been providing consistent inservice training to regular college faculty and staff, and that there are few available resources for developing programs for this student population. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED303971

POLICIES, GUIDELINES, AND SERVICES FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED STUDENT AT OXNARD COLLEGE

by

Joan Jones

A Major Applied Research Project presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

August, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 212265

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Heartfelt gratitude is expressed to the committee members for their assistance in this project, Dr. John R. West and Dr. Philip H. DeTurk, and especially to Dr. Frederick C. Kintzer for his guidance and knowledgeable feedback. Further gratitude is expressed to the participants who gave of their time and to everyone at Oxnard College who supported my efforts, particularly Dr. William Lawson.

A special thanks to my dear friends Cassandra Carraway, Dr. Brison Torbert, Steven Sworder, and Harry Albertson, III, who all had the remarkable talent of making doctoral studies enjoyable. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Marla Keesee who appeared to have psychic abilities in deciphering reams of material and the ability to turn them into a typewritten work of art.

I gratefully acknowledge my parents John and Betty Nestler, who have always encouraged, loved, and supported me. Significant debt and appreciation is expressed to Drs. Ron and Mary Hulnick for clearly demonstrating to me the possibilities available through higher education.

I lovingly acknowledge the daily assistance and support of my best friend and husband Scott. I also

001 3

lovingly acknowledge my children Tracy and Travis, who inspired me with the persistence to complete this project; and to John-Roger, simply thank you!

Finally, to all the students I serve with developmental disabilities, I thank you for all you have taught me and dedicate this project to you.

Abstract of a Major Applied Research Project Presented
to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Education

POLICIES, GUIDELINES, AND SERVICES FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED STUDENT AT OXNARD COLLEGE

by

Joan Jones

August, 1988

A current issue in the California Community Colleges is that of serving the "developmentally disabled" learner. Developmentally disabled students are an extremely heterogeneous group ranging from individuals who are intellectually gifted but who have severe physical impairments to those who are severely mentally retarded but who are physically perfectly sound. The purposes of this study were: (1) to determine the California Community Colleges' policies on serving the developmentally disabled adult and to identify the federal and state statutes regulating the community colleges serving the developmentally disabled adult; (2) to determine what programs and related services are offered for the developmentally disabled adult at the California Community Colleges; (3) to identify what criteria are utilized by

special education offices for determining a developmentally disabled adult's eligibility for their program(s); and (4) to develop a series of policies, guidelines, educational services, and related services for the developmentally disabled learner at Oxnard College and a plan for implementing and evaluating the program.

Two survey questionnaires were developed as part of this study. The mail-in questionnaire was sent to each of the California Community Colleges. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, each institution identified as having an established developmentally disabled program was asked to complete the survey questionnaire as well as respond to a telephone survey. Their educational materials were also requested. Upon completing all telephone interviews and receiving all requested documents from the participating colleges, the data were tabulated and analyzed by utilizing content analysis, measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, and percentage.

The findings revealed that: (a) twenty-five percent of the 106 California Community Colleges had established on-campus programs for students with developmental disabilities; (b) mandatory assessment and program placement were provided in over seventy percent of the colleges for this student population; (c) the most widely utilized services by the colleges in their programs for students with developmental disabilities were special classes, counseling, and physical education; (d) the range in student enrollment

was noted from thirteen students to over 1,200 students; and (e) sixty-eight percent of the colleges surveyed had conducted formal evaluations of their programs.

It was concluded that: (a) programs for students with developmental disabilities on the California Community College campuses, for the most part, are still nonexistent; (b) not all of the colleges perceive a need to offer services to students with developmental disabilities; (c) developmentally disabled adults were appropriate community college students; (d) special education personnel have not been providing inservice training on a regular basis with any consistency to "regular" college faculty and staff; and (e) there are few available resources for developing programs for this student population on community college campuses.

Recommendations were that: (a) results of the study be shared with appropriate administrators at Oxnard College for program implementation purposes; (b) the study should be used as a justification for the budget expense request for program implementation; (c) additional funding sources be explored by appropriate Oxnard College administration; and (d) the Oxnard College special education department developmental disabilities specialist should provide an inservice training program for all Oxnard College administrators, faculty, and staff prior to the program's implementation and on an ongoing basis thereafter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Significance	2
Major Research Questions	6
Purpose	6
Definition of Terms	7
Limitations	8
Assumptions	9
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
Federal and State Legislation	10
Factors Influencing Change on College or University Campuses	20
Developmental Education Programs for the Developmentally Disabled College Student	23
3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY	35
Questionnaire	36
Administration of the Questionnaires	37
Data Analysis	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
4.	PRESENTATION OF RESULTS.	40
	Institutional Information.	40
	Program Components	42
	Student Services	44
	Institutional Research	46
	Educational Impact	51
5.	INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	53
	Summary and Interpretation of Results. . .	53
	Conclusions.	57
	Implications for the Improvement of Practice	68
	Strategies for Improvement, Implementation, and Diffusion.	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		72
APPENDIXES.		78
A.	THE COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT IMPLEMENTATION SCALE	79
B.	RINCK SELF-REPORT ASSESSMENT SCALES.	82
C.	LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	85
D.	SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	89
E.	TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	93
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF STUDENT.		96

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Established Programs for Developmentally Disabled Adults.	41
2.	Length of Program.	42
3.	Institutional Support.	42
4.	Program Components for Developmentally Disabled Students.	43
5.	Student Services	46
6.	Student Enrollment	48
7.	Average Length of Program Participation. . .	49
8.	Program Evaluation	50

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

If the open-door policy of the community college is to be meaningful, then professionals in developmental education as well as instructors and administrators must become working partners integrated into the total fabric of the educational process (Ahrendt, 1987:2). Developmental education programs in community colleges are the logical outgrowth of the focus on access that has characterized the history of American higher education (Cohen and Brawer, 1982:6).

A current issue in the California Community Colleges is that of serving the "developmentally disabled" learner. Developmentally disabled people are an extremely heterogeneous group. The population can range from those who are intellectually gifted but who have severe physical impairment to those who are severely mentally retarded but who are physically and perfectly sound (Summers, 1986:9).

Several federal mandates (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act: P.L. 94-142; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973: P.L. 93-112; and the Vocational Education Act Amendments: P.L. 94-482) reflect a major change in the nation's social and economic awareness (Stodden and Browder,

1985). The traditional continuum of postsecondary rehabilitation and habilitation services remains in a more underdeveloped state than the legal provision of educational services. The services are provided through a number of agencies and within the context of several conflicting delivery modes (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

Background and Significance

The provision of support and rehabilitation services for the severely disabled college student is a recent development in American higher education (Mallik and Shaver, 1980). It is interesting to note that higher education is among the last social institutions to activate the verbal concern and compassion for disabled persons that has long been an expressed ideal in American society (Decker, 1980). The movement integrating disabled persons into the mainstream of societal participation, in general, has increased dramatically in recent years.

Wolfensberger (1972) noted that the major philosophical impetus of community-based training and integration is embodied in the principle of normalization, that is, stressing the delivery of service and resulting client participation in environments that are as culturally normal as possible. Rusch and Schultz (1981) interpreted this principle as the need to refocus structure and expand programs for disabled persons to encompass preparatory skills and behaviors necessary for participation within

societal roles of value available to most residents of a community. The rights of over thirty-six million disabled individuals who wish to receive rehabilitative, habilitative, and special education services (Bellamy et al., 1979) is the recognition and affirmation that becoming a productive member of society is not only desirable but a primary goal.

The politics of developmental education over the past twenty years suggest the struggle by legislators, state agencies, and educators, as well as other groups, to define the role and nature of the community college (McGrath and Spear, 1987). Nontraditional learners themselves have confused conceptions of education and in their sense of themselves as learners (Young and Staebler, 1987). According to McGrath and Spear (1987), a reconstruction of the community college is needed to fulfill its mission in the 1980s.

In line with this concept, the California Community College system has begun serving the developmentally disabled learner. However, Cohen (1987) reported that some people believe that community colleges as institutions of higher learning should not offer developmental education courses. Carbone (1987:26) suggested that when given adequate resources, it is possible to design a model system of learning assistance services for the typically diverse clientele of the community college and for the practitioners who function there. It follows, then, that developing

programmatic services directed toward the needs of the developmentally disabled adult would be a viable direction for community colleges to undertake.

Although they are well-intentioned, many human services programs that have been developed for persons with developmental disabilities have failed to achieve their goals. Occasionally, they have even exacerbated the problems they were designed to solve. The task of designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs for students with developmental disabilities must now become proactive, rather than reactive (Summers, 1986). As students with developmental disabilities are increasingly seeking postsecondary education, additional trained personnel will be required to meet this demand. The implementation of a cross-disciplinary training effort is suggested as critical to the development of programs for this population of college or university students (Ackler and Booth, 1980).

Commonly held myths seemed to be a possible stumbling block in incorporating more programs for developmentally disabled students on the community college campuses. The literature disputed the ideas that:

1. Students with developmental disabilities are not qualified nor responsible enough to be counted on;
2. The faculty is too busy to become involved;

3. Innovative programs need large capital expenditures to begin operation; and
4. It is not the intended goal of educational institutions to support community outreach programs--especially institutions in higher education.

It has been well documented in the literature that developmental education programs and related services in the community colleges are both practical responses to student literacy and essential components in the protection of the community college's identity. Community colleges are now facing a new challenge and mandate to provide appropriate instruction and services to students with developmental disabilities.

This study should be useful to the California Community Colleges because it informs them of colleges' (a) current educational efforts with developmentally disabled students; (b) impact of programs for the developmentally disabled college student; and (c) policies, guidelines, principles of developmental education, program planning, educational activities; and (d) appropriate services for students with developmental disabilities.

Major Research Questions

The discussion of integrating and providing services for students with developmental disabilities on the community college campuses raises many issues. In spite of the abundance of legislation on persons with developmental disabilities into the community colleges, progress and services in many institutions are limited at best. The definitions (by law) change, but the point remains that people who are disabled, whether it be mental, physical, or otherwise, want and need the opportunities to live as independently as possible, be entitled to the same types and quality of services, and be treated with all the dignity and respect that nondisabled people want (Ackler and Booth, 1980).

This study explored the following questions:

1. How are the California Community Colleges addressing the issue of serving the developmentally disabled learner on the campus?
2. What educational impact will serving developmentally disabled learners have on the California Community Colleges?

Purpose

The purposes of this study were to: (1) determine the California Community Colleges' policies on serving the developmentally disabled adult; (2) determine what programs

and related services are offered for the developmentally disabled adult at the California Community Colleges; (3) identify what criteria are utilized by special education/ handicapped services offices for determining a developmentally disabled adult's eligibility for their program(s) and identify the federal and state statutes regulating the community colleges serving the developmentally disabled adult; and (4) develop a series of policies, guidelines, educational services, and related services for the developmentally disabled adult at Oxnard College and a plan for implementing and evaluating the program.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

1. Developmentally disabled learner. The term developmentally disabled means a "chronic mental or physical impairment," such as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, autism, or learning disability that occurred before the age of twenty-two (Ackler and Booth, 1980). These terms "developmentally disabled adult" and "developmentally disabled student" will be used synonymously for the purpose of this study.

2. Independent living skills. This term refers to living skills such as shopping, preparing meals, reading bus schedules, and managing money.
3. Social skills training. This term refers to courses providing training with the focus of developing appropriate "social skills" needed for success on the college campus and on the job.
4. Programs for developmentally disabled learners. This term refers to a program that within its statement of philosophy and goals is to enhance the development of each student in a positive direction according to their abilities on a community college campus (Gelman, 1983). This will be evidenced by attitudinal changes and behaviors of the faculty toward the developmentally disabled learner and the provision of an active program/educational plan for the students to follow (Noel et al., 1982).

Limitations

This study was limited in the following ways:

1. The study is a survey of existing programs and services for developmentally disabled adults at California Community Colleges and does not include other programs in other states nor effective programs for developmentally disabled

adults managed by other institutions or organizations.

2. The study is descriptive in nature and its results could not be stated in terms of cause and effect relationships.
3. The study was limited by the willingness and ability of the respondents to answer the questionnaires accurately and candidly.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. California Community Colleges' special education directors/coordinators have sufficient knowledge of developmental education and related services for adults with developmental disabilities on their campus(es) to complete without detailed explanation a questionnaire (both written and verbal) that employs basic terminology related to the topic at hand.
2. California Community Colleges are aware of the importance of developmental education and are involved in providing this services as well as related services to the developmentally disabled adult on the college campus.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature was reviewed for information regarding the developmentally disabled learner in postsecondary education, effective community-based programs, and services for the developmentally disabled adult. The information revealed consisted of the following: (1) federal and state mandates dictating equal opportunity and access to individuals with handicapping conditions, (2) factors believed or known to influence change on college or university campuses for students with developmental disabilities, and (3) approaches community colleges could take in implementing and evaluating developmental education programs for students with developmental disabilities. This information provided the conceptual base for the study.

Federal and State Legislation

One of the many descriptive labels attached to an individual signifying that the person is experiencing some type of impairment is the term "developmentally disabled." This term is unique because it is a legislative invention and was not in general use until the 1970 Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act

(P.L. 91-517) (Summers, 1986:3). The legislation originally grouped certain diagnostic categories: mental retardation, autism, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy. Over three-fourths of the seriously disabled adults acquiring their handicaps in childhood encompass this diagnosis (Gardner et al., 1980:4).

Legal Definition of Developmental Disability

A new developmentally disabled act was established in 1978. It changed the categorical labeling practices that often compound the handicap. The current legal definition is as follows:

The term developmental disabilities means a severe disability of a person that:

1. Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments.
2. Is manifested before the person attains age twenty-two.
3. Is likely to continue indefinitely.
4. Results in substantial functional limitation in three or more of the following areas of major life activity:
    A. Self-care (daily activities enabling a person to meet basic life needs for food, hygiene, and appearance).
    B. Receptive and expressive language (communication involving verbal and

nonverbal behavior enabling a person both to understand others and to express ideas and information to others).

C. Learning (general cognitive competence and ability to acquire new behaviors, perceptions, and information and apply experiences to new situations).

D. Mobility (ability to use fine and gross motor skills, ability to move one's person from one place to another with or without mechanical aids).

E. Self-direction (management and taking control over one's social and personal life; ability to make decisions affecting and protecting one's self-interest).

F. Capacity for independent living (age-appropriate ability to live without extraordinary assistance).

G. Economic self-sufficiency (maintaining adequate employment and financial support).

5. Reflects the person's need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic care, treatment, or other services which are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated (Gardner et al., 1980:5).

Title V Regulations--Revised California

The California Community Colleges served approximately 50,000 handicapped students for the 1986-87 school year which is a dramatic increase from the 4,800 students served in 1973 (California Community College Board of Governors, 1987). Funding for special programs and services are provided through local revenues; state apportionments; federal vocational education funds, including gifts and grants; and supplemental state funds pursuant to Assembly Bill 77 (AB77) (California Community College Board of Governors, 1987:2). AB77 established the principle of "direct excess costs" that allocates funds to meet the additional costs for educating these students.

Disabled Students' Programs and Services

The general provisions and definitions according to Section 56000--Title V Regulations (California Community College Board of Governors, 1987:4) are as follows: This chapter applies to community college districts offering educational programs and support services, on and/or off campus, to students with disabilities pursuant to Education Code Sections 78600 and 84850.

Programs receiving funds apportioned pursuant to Education Code Section 84850 shall meet the requirements of this chapter. Any expenditures under the authority of this chapter must meet the following conditions:

1. The service or instruction is consistent with the stated purpose of programs for students with disabilities as set forth in this chapter.
2. The service or instruction does not duplicate services or instruction which are otherwise available to all students.
3. The educational need for the service or instruction is directly related to the functional limitations of the verifiable disabilities of the students to be served.
4. The need for the service or instruction is directly related to the student's participation in the educational process.
5. The goals of services and/or instruction are independence and maximum integration of students with disabilities. Services and/or instruction should lead to successful participation in the general college curriculum, vocational preparation, and enhanced potential for achieving personal/social goals.
6. Services or instruction are provided in the most integrated setting possible consistent with the mission of the community college.

Developmentally Delayed Learner

The developmentally delayed learner, according to Section 56018 of the Title V Regulations (California

Community College Board of Governors, 1987:A5), is a student who exhibits the following:

1. Below average intellectual functioning.
2. Impaired social functioning.
3. Potential for measurable achievement in instructional and employment settings.
4. Measured appropriate adaptive behavior in an instructional or employment setting as defined in Section 56004.

Section 56004: Appropriate Adaptive Behavior

Appropriate adaptive behavior is the behavior of a student who assumes the social responsibility necessary to participate in the educational setting in which the student is enrolled (Title V Regulations--Section 56004) (California Community College Board of Governors, 1987:A3). According to this rule, when a determination is needed, appropriate adaptive behavior shall be determined by certificated DSP&S staff.

Federal Laws in Providing Services to Persons with Disabilities

There are two recently reauthorized federal laws providing services to persons with disabilities: (1) the Education of the Handicapped Act (amended by the 98th Congress through Public Law 98-199) and (2) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (amended by the 98th Congress

through Public Law 98-527). The Education of the Handicapped Act includes the following components: general provisions assistance for education of all handicapped children, centers and services to meet special needs of the handicapped children, centers and services to meet special needs of the handicapped adult, training personnel for the education of the handicapped individual, research in the education of the handicapped individual, and instructional media for the handicapped individual.

The Rehabilitation Act as amended in 1975 (Congress of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, 1985:45) contains the following seven areas of concern: (1) vocational rehabilitation services, (2) research and training, (3) supplementary services and facilities, (4) national council on the handicapped, (5) miscellaneous, (6) employment opportunities for handicapped individuals, and (7) comprehensive services for independent living.

The Developmental Disabilities Act of 1985 (Congress of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, 1985:127) is the newest of the federal mandates and contains sections on general provisions, federal assistance for planning and service activities for persons with developmental disabilities, protection and advocacy of individual rights, university affiliated facilities, and special project grants. Although both federal laws affect the persons with developmental disabilities, this study

primarily addressed the concerns noted in the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1984.

Programs for Persons with Developmental Disabilities: P.L. 98-527

Public Law 89-527 was enacted on October 19, 1984, and is cited as the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act. The findings and purposes of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act were noted as:

1. There are more than two million persons with developmental disabilities in the United States.
2. Individuals with disabilities occurring during their developmental period are more vulnerable and less able to reach an independent level or existence than other handicapped individuals who generally have had a normal developmental period on which to draw during the rehabilitation process.
3. Persons with developmental disabilities often require specialized lifelong services to be provided by many agencies in a coordinated manner in order to meet the persons' needs.
4. Generic service agencies and agencies providing specialized services to disabled persons tend to overlook or exclude persons with developmental

disabilities in their planning and delivery of services.

5. It is in the national interest to strengthen specific programs, especially programs that reduce or eliminate the need for institutional care, to meet the needs of persons with developmental disabilities.

It is the overall purpose of this Title to assist states to (a) assure that persons with developmental disabilities receive care, treatment, and other services necessary to enable them to achieve their maximum potential through increased independence, productivity, and integration into the community and (b) establish and operate a system which coordinates, monitors, plans and evaluates services which ensure the protection of the legal and human rights of persons with developmental disabilities (Congress of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, 1985:144).

The specific purposes of the Title are:

1. To assist in the provision of comprehensive services to persons with developmental disabilities, with priority to those persons whose needs are not otherwise met under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or other health education or welfare programs.
2. To assist states in appropriate planning activities.

3. To make grants to states and public and private nonprofit agencies to establish model programs, to demonstrate innovative rehabilitation techniques, and to train professional and paraprofessional personnel with respect to providing services to persons with developmental disabilities.
4. To make grants to university-affiliated facilities to assist them in administering and operating demonstration facilities for the provision of services to persons with developmental disabilities and interdisciplinary training programs for personnel needed to provide specialized services for these persons.
5. To make grants to support a system in each state to protect the legal and human rights of all persons with developmental disabilities.

Despite the abundance of legislation to assure the integration or reintegration of adults with developmental disabilities into the life of the community, their needs in gaining competitive employment opportunities have been largely unmet (Woods et al., 1985). This also holds true for these individuals gaining access to institutions of higher learning (Ackler and Booth, 1980).

Factors Influencing Change on College or University Campuses

As indicated earlier, the issues of the provision of support, habilitative and rehabilitative services for persons with developmental disabilities in the community college, is a recent development in American higher education (Mallik and Shaver, 1980). The issue of competitive work for persons with developmental disabilities has also received increased attention over the past few years (Woods et al., 1985). Developmental disabled personnel, programs, and sheltered workshops have traditionally focused their efforts to sheltered work and daily living skills (Woods et al., 1985) and the thought of participating in programs in an institution of higher education was not even a consideration (Ackler and Booth, 1980).

Gardner et al. (1980:6) noted that all individuals, regardless of their degree of disability, are growing and changing persons. Even the most seriously impaired person, therefore, should be assisted to participate as fully as possible in systems that support the most culturally appropriate and age-typical life continuum. They further explained that it is no longer acceptable to use diagnostic labels to determine a person's potential to learn or ability to profit from services. Behavioral technology is available and successful in teaching new behaviors and skills to

persons formerly believed to be "too low to benefit" from any programmatic interventions.

Persons with special developmental needs require the opportunity to advance along the developmental continuum. They can be assisted in doing this by specific programs and services that will:

1. Provide stimulating environments that foster growth.
2. Utilize appropriate techniques to reduce stigma.
3. Identify obstacles to growth.
4. Teach functional behaviors and skills (Gardner et al., 1980).

Concern over the quality of services available to handicapped persons, the basic human rights of the handicapped, adherence to the principle of normalization in service delivery, and the growing militancy on the part of handicapped persons have created an atmosphere of rapid social change (Gelman, 1983:20). Gardner et al. (1987:7) cited that what is most frequently forgotten throughout the service system is focusing attention to basic human needs. They continued by expressing the opinion that all persons need recognition, physical and emotional warmth, productive and meaningful work, friendships, a sense of community, identity, success and achievement, access to services, opportunities for self-expression, and much more. When persons with disabilities are recognized as having human needs, programs can be built to nurture the development of

the whole person (Perske, 1978:26). The above authors commented in their extensive surveys that the personal characteristics and attitudes of campus professionals were of much greater importance than the design and structure of the learning assistance program.

Despite the deep problems inherent in vocational services for adults with developmental disabilities, there are hopeful signs. For the first time, there are demonstrated service delivery models that are not only replicable but meet the criteria of high quality human services and, as a result, are effective (Pomerantz and Marholin, 1986:165). These authors further indicated that if programs continue to improve by using community-referenced curricula, integrated settings, and well-designed systematic instruction, graduates will be more competent and there will be rich payoffs for the developmentally disabled adults themselves, for their families, and for their communities.

Gardner et al. (1980) noted concurrently with the above statements by citing that one of the most interesting shifts in the field of developmental disabilities has been the growth of potential suggested by Marc Gold (1987:68):

> The height of a . . . person's level of functioning is determined by the availability of training, technology and the amount of resources society is willing to allocate . . . not by significant limitations in biological potential.

Carbone's (1987) conclusion of developmental education was that providing learning assistance services is

clearly an obligation of the community college. He cited the other side of the coin as an equally important obligation to insist on unequivocal standards of achievements for all students in all disciplines. Creating an expectation of success is an integral part of the teaching/learning process, and the failure to equip both student and teacher with the skills needed to achieve those expectations is unconscionable (Carbone, 1987).

Developmental Education Programs for the Developmentally Disabled College Student

Findings of Noel et al. (1982:8) in the area of successful developmental education evolved around the components of transition and orientation activities and study or survival skills that gives the program a common denominator. Noel et al. (1982:7) further described a comprehensive program:

> Students must learn to motivate themselves, to understand their learning strengths and weaknesses, to negotiate the academic and social systems, and adapt effective and efficient methods of processing information, and to alter previously established attitudes about their own potential and their sense of self-worth. These needs are best met by college programs that provide a range of services that attend to special developmental needs while considering the adjustments of the whole person to the college environment.

Carbone (1987:25), cited in Roueche's (1984) report on a University of Texas study of college and university responses to low-achieving students, developed a checklist

of characteristics of successful programs. The eleven "elements of success" noted were:

1. Strong administrative support
2. Mandatory assessment and placement upon entry
3. Structured courses and follow-up for nonattenders
4. Award of credit for developmental courses
5. Flexible completion features
6. Multiple learning systems, accessed through learning prescriptions based on assessment data
7. Use of only volunteer instructors in developmental courses
8. Extensive use of peer tutors
9. Frequent monitoring of student behaviors
10. Interfacing with subsequent courses
11. Program evaluation based on adequate data collection procedures.

Stodden and Browder (1985) noted in a study focusing on obtaining and maintaining competitive employment for fifty-two individuals with developmental disabilities that several successful learning methods were used. The foundation for the training/teaching methodology was experiential learning and individual instruction as these individuals with developmental disabilities passed through several steps on their way to both successful training and competitive employment. The steps were outlined as follows:

Assessment: All participants were provided a comprehensive assessment and evaluation, involving clinical and situational assessment procedures. The situational assessment component was noted to be the most effective which observed the applicant in seven areas: (1) attendance and stamina, (2) independence, (3) productivity, (4) learning style, (5) work habits, (6) social skills and communication, and (7) personal management (Stodden and Browder, 1985:32). In addition to the assessments, the project included two questionnaires as part of the intake interview. The first was utilized to ascertain the person's desire to work and sense of work responsibility. This interview enabled the intake counselor to distinguish between those applicants who viewed the training program primarily as a place to occupy one's time from those who viewed it as a road to greater independence and/or employment. The second questionnaire focused on the applicant's home support system, whether the support system was family members or agency home managers. The home support questionnaire was used to investigate the family's attitude toward the disabled person's ability to ascertain employment as well as the family's willingness to provide emotional support. The literature over the past forty years has consistently noted the valuable impact and influence of the family as a significant variable in employment success (O'Brien, 1952; Badham, 1955; Kolstoe, 1961; Edgerton, 1967; Stodden and Browder, 1985).

Preemployment training: This component consisted of work adjustment training in attendance, punctuality, following directions, cooperativeness, perseverance, and communication. The training strategies and teaching methodologies utilized were individual and group problem-solving exercises, role-play situations with video recorded feedback, peer tutoring, and practical experiences that were conducted in retail, government, and other community locations (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

Work experience: The work experience component allowed the participants to develop good work habits, social interaction and problem-solving skills, self-confidence, and job skills in community environments that were supportive of their employment goals (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

On-site training in competitive employment: This type of on-site training was best utilized when focusing on production speed and quality, work habits, and interpersonal skills (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

Supported employment: The program provided support to developmentally disabled employees in a number of ways. Instruction was provided in life skills that would contribute to greater independence in such areas such as money management, consumer skills, and nutrition awareness. Work-related counseling that focused on handling interpersonal problems on the job, coping with responsibility, and career planning proved to be successful. Recreation/service clubs assisted the developmentally

disabled persons with social contacts and friendships (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

Job satisfaction was noted in a similar study by Judd et al. (1981) who reported that the developmentally disabled adults surveyed expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their jobs after two years of employment. Talkington and Overbeck (1975:19) noted that when comparing job satisfaction and actual work performance of forty-five mentally retarded females that the job satisfaction component was "significantly related to job performance for retarded workers."

Sheltered Work Environments

The literature suggests that the new practices of community-based education for adults with developmental disabilities appear to be much more successful than past efforts of the sheltered work environment. Even though the specific programs and clientele within sheltered workshops have changed over the years, the conceptual model as a dominant service delivery vehicle has prevailed within the self-contained sheltered context (Stodden and Browder, 1985). The sheltered workshop practices, management and overall programmatic relevancy, has been criticized as a service delivery model for persons with disabilities (Pomerantz and Marholin, 1977; Greenleigh Association, 1975). National reports (Appleby, 1978; U.S. Department of Labor, 1979) strongly noted that sheltered workshops have

not demonstrated effectiveness in transitioning trainees from sheltered workshop programs to competitive employment roles or in providing any significant remunerative work within workshop facilities (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

The average overall placement rate for sheltered workshops is also noted to be noneffective according to the United States Department of Labor (1979) report citing twelve percent per year, and only thirty-four percent of the workshops surveyed employed a full-time placement specialist. Stodden and Browder (1985) suggested that the use of these sheltered programming structures with disabled persons have often not reflected the principles of normalization, the opportunity for growth, and participation with social value, or transitional movement toward independent and productive skills and behaviors. Stodden and Browder further noted that:

> These problems of stagnation within the continuum of rehabilitative and habilitative services coupled with the growing awareness that disabled persons should have equal opportunity to lead dignified and normal lives make it necessary to encourage an explanation of alternative service delivery models (Stodden and Browder, 1985:24).

The College for Living at Metropolitan State College

The College for Living Project at Metropolitan State College in Denver, Colorado, is a multidisciplinary approach to education for adults with developmental disabilities that is integrated with a "regular" college that was founded in September 1974 (Ackler and Booth, 1980). The purpose of the

college is to assist adults with developmental disabilities to learn community living skills through a low-cost program in a college setting.

Ackler and Booth (1980) noted that since the program's beginning in 1974, The College for Living Project has grown not only at Metropolitan State College, but also at twenty-five other locations in seven different states around the country. Currently, 1,700 developmentally disabled adults participate in community living skills classes each semester at the various locations. Approximately 300 degree students teaching these classes appear to receive positive experience in working with developmentally disabled adults.

Ackler and Booth (1980:75) noted the key components and resources in establishing this type of program as outlined below:

1. Keep The College for Living (or similar program) affiliated with a college so large numbers of nonhandicapped people can serve as role models.
2. Make sure that the skills and curricula you are teaching are directly related to a goal needed and wanted by the students.
3. Keep the program basic, allowing for many, many steps in the program.
4. Provide for a recognition of growth and achievement with rewards, certificates, certification, or credit.

5. Require a registration fee, the same that any other adult in an education program would pay.

Kreps (1980) cited that a curriculum designed for the college-based program included thirteen critical areas focusing on survival in the community. Activities included the following:

1. Keeping healthy
2. Living safely
3. Homemaking and family living
4. Understanding oneself and getting along with others
5. Understanding the physical environment
6. Appreciating and creating beauty
7. Being a responsible citizen
8. Leisure time
9. Earning a living
10. Traveling
11. Money management
12. Human sexuality
13. Communicating ideas.

It was noted that adult developmentally disabled learners were like any adult learner in their instructional demands (Ackler and Booth, 1980). They did not appreciate busy work, and the instructor must positively reinforce the efforts of the students. Most importantly, the student must experience success and failure as informational cues through learning (Kreps, 1980). Strowbridge (1978) suggested that

both success and achievement are key needs. Safety, love, belonging, and self-esteem were noted to be important by Maslow (1954) for an individual if he/she is to become self-actualized. Strowbridge (1987) added that safety is not limited to physical safety, but it encompasses freedom from the embarrassment of not knowing, of not understanding, and of having mistakes, errors, and unsuccessful attempts at solving problems be revealed publicly. Consequently, many students in developmental education programs are reluctant to ask questions and prefer to suffer in silence and ignorance (Strowbridge, 1987). In conclusion, Ahrendt (1987:88) cited Strowbridge's statement:

> Love and belonging may seem to be far removed from the . . . classroom. What we must consider is that excellent learning occurs through interaction between and among individuals within a mutually respectful group. Not only are basic facts and information exchanged; they are also offered, discussed, and considered. The student who feels that he or she belongs to the group can be an active participant; feel free to offer ideas, suggestions, and possible solutions; ask questions and through this process learn much of what we wish the student to know about the subject. The student who does not feel that he or she belongs misses these opportunities and severely limits his or her learning and understanding.

Program Evaluation Methods

The College for Living has established several different and effective program evaluation methods (Black, 1980) as follows:

1. Testing a few individuals' progress by setting up an objective experiment and publishing the results.

2. Conducting a cost-comparison study (e.g., the cost per student at a college-based program is compared to the cost per student in an "equivalent" program).
3. Setting up teaching criteria to examine optimum student success factors.
4. Measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of project management.
5. Conducting an individual needs assessment when the evaluation foundation is being constructed.

Evaluation methods focusing on student progress noted two different rating scales developed specifically for adults with developmental disabilities. The scales are outlined as follows:

1. The Competitive Employment Implementation Scale (CEIS) was created to evaluate the effects of training for persons with developmental disabilities (Woods et al., 1985:37). The CEIS measures a training participant's/student's acceptance of responsibility with respect to competitive employment as the "goals" (see Appendix A).
2. Rinck (1986:15) developed two self-report assessment scales designed to measure general life satisfaction and leisure activity levels of developmentally disabled adults (see Appendix B). Among the reported results were:

> (1) perceived health was significantly correlated with life satisfaction, (2) clients rated their own life satisfaction more highly than did informants, and (3) there was a close correlation between clients' self-reported activity levels and informants' perceptions.

This recent trend in the vocational rehabilitation and habilitation literature (Stodden and Browder, 1985) and also in developmental education programs in higher education (Ahrendt, 1987; Ackler and Booth, 1980) identifies the procedure to prepare individuals to be placed in the mainstream of society without the "shelter" of isolated programs. These investigations apply learning behavior principles to the acquisition and performance of specific tasks and experiential learning. According to Black (1980), these components cannot be forgotten during the program evaluation process.

Over the past several years, a number of competitive employment training and placement models as well as educational training models, such as The College for Living, have been developed for adults with developmental disabilities (Schultz et al., 1980; Ackler, 1980; Wehman and Hill, 1980; Mithaug et al., 1977; Stodden, 1980). A few of these models have been expanded and applied in demonstration programs with an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of

sequenced activities and outcomes and impacts (Stodden and Browder, 1985).

In summation, the focus of the literature review has been to: (1) cite current federal and state mandates with respect to citizens with developmental disabilities; (2) describe successful efforts in training, educating, placing, and maintaining persons with developmental disabilities within institutions of higher education; and (3) analyze the variables in training methodologies and student characteristics as they contribute in the educational and work settings.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The research questions for this study were addressed first by conducting a thorough search of the literature for citations regarding community colleges, two-year colleges, junior colleges, colleges, and universities, focusing on the developmentally disabled learner in postsecondary education. A second search was conducted focusing on effective community-based programs and services for the developmentally disabled adult because the first search consisting of a computer search (e.g., Information Retrieval Service: Nova University, ERIC, and others) provided limited information. Numerous sources were utilized in collecting the data such as current textbooks, education journals and magazines, curricula, and past published works on model programs for adults with developmental disabilities.

All the California Community Colleges' special education/handicapped programs were involved in this descriptive study (see Appendix C). Policies, guidelines, and services for the developmentally disabled student at Oxnard College were drawn from a careful review of the related literature. These policies, guidelines, and

services were identified in Chapter 2 and in specific instances were accounted for in the final chapters.

Questionnaire

In the development of the survey questionnaire, the questions were conceptually derived from a number of sources: (a) the California Community College Chancellor's Office, (b) HSP & S Reporting Form for Disabled Students Programs Services, (c) Roueche (1984), (d) Young and Staebler (1987), and (e) Stodden (1985). A faculty of educators experienced with the developmentally disabled student has informally reviewed the questionnaire for content, comprehensiveness, verbiage, and grammar. This review enhanced the validity of the questionnaire. In addition, the questions that were derived from the above noted sources added to the reliability of the questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire is presented in Appendix D.

The foundation of the questionnaire covered the eight following broad topic areas:

1. Roueche's (1984) "eleven" elements of success for developmental programs
2. Special education instructional data
3. Current curriculum
4. Current student services
5. Instructor/counselor student follow-up
6. Inservice training for "regular" faculty/staff

7. Student and program evaluation
8. Funding sources.

Telephone Survey Questionnaire

In the development of the telephone survey questionnaire, the identical process was utilized as was outlined above in the mail-in questionnaire. The preliminary telephone survey questionnaire is presented in Appendix E.

Administration of the Questionnaires

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges provided a list containing all the California Community Colleges' special education/handicapped program directors' and/or coordinators' names and addresses. An individually typed, personally addressed and signed letter was sent to each identified director or coordinator at each college explaining the purpose of the study, describing the questionnaire and the extent of their involvement and assuring complete confidentiality of institutional information. Additionally, the institution was told that for those institutions that had established developmentally disabled programs, additional program information would be requested from them by telephone. This mailing also included the survey questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope.

When a response was not received within two weeks, a written follow-up letter was sent. When the follow-up letter proved ineffective, a telephone call was made. Each institution responding affirmatively to the survey was telephoned and asked to participate in the telephone survey questionnaire.

The mail-in survey questionnaire contained questions grouped into three broad classes: (1) institutional information, (2) developmentally disabled program information and related services, and (3) institutional research information. The telephone survey questionnaire contained questions grouped into two broad classes: (1) institutional information and (2) in-depth developmentally disabled program information.

Those institutions identified as having an established developmentally disabled student program were requested to send a copy of their developmentally disabled policies, guidelines, outline of current curriculum, and student and program evaluation outlines. The information received from the completed questionnaire assisted in addressing the first three purposes of this study.

In order to identify the federal and state statutes regulating the California Community Colleges serving the developmentally disabled adult, a separate investigation was conducted. This was accomplished by conducting an in-depth analysis of the federal and state statutes in Chapter 2. This analysis addressed the third purpose of this study.

Finally, an in-depth analysis of all documents and materials received from the responding California Community Colleges and the federal and state statutes, policies, and documents regulating the California Community Colleges in serving the developmentally disabled adult was the basis for addressing the fourth purpose of the study.

Data Analysis

Data from the two questionnaires were tabulated and analyzed by the following methods: content analysis, measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, and percentage. Frequency distributions and percentages were used to analyze the responses to the questions. These two methods were used to determine if there were any differences that could be attributed to program or institutional characteristics. Content analysis and measures of central tendency were used to analyze open-ended questions. Throughout the discussion of the findings, tables were used to present the data.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

One-hundred percent of the 106 California Community Colleges responded to the questionnaire and telephone surveys, resulting in usable data by the established deadline date. The study addressed the two research questions presented in Chapter 1. Study results were presented in five sections that corresponded with the research questions: (1) current institutional information, (2) program components, (3) student services, (4) institutional research, and (5) educational impact.

Institutional Information

The results of the study noted those community colleges that provided programs and services for students with developmental disabilities. The study focused on only those policies, guidelines, and programs for the developmentally disabled adult. Analysis of the information provided by the respondents (shown in Table 1) indicated that only twenty-six of the California Community Colleges had established on-campus programs for this population. These institutions were the focus of the study.

Table 1

Established Programs for Developmentally Disabled Adults

Item (n = 106)	Yes		No	
	F	%	F	%
Established policies, guidelines, and programs	26	25	80	75

It was interesting to note that only one institution surveyed had an established program for over thirty years. The average number of years of operation noted in the study was eleven years. The most recently established program was cited as being in operation for three years as shown in Table 2.

Strong administrative support was noted to be critical in establishing and operating programs for developmentally disabled adults on college campuses. Therefore, it was not surprising to note that twenty-two (85%) of the institutions surveyed with established programs indicated strong administrative support for the program and services that are operational in the California Community Colleges (see Table 3).

Table 2

Length of Program

Item	F	%
1 - 5 years	2	8
6 - 10 years	13	50
11 - 15 years	9	34
16 - 20 years	1	4
21 - 25 years	0	0
26 - 30 years plus	1	4
Total (n = 26)	26	100

Table 3

Institutional Support

Item (n = 26)	Yes		No	
	F	%	F	%
Institutions with strong administrative support	22	85	4	15

Program Components

As shown in Table 4, mandatory assessment and placement of students was noted to be a key "element of success" in developmental programs. Nineteen (73%) of the programs serving the developmentally disabled adult in the

California Community Colleges have mandatory assessment and placement of students upon entry into selected courses and/or services. Additionally, twenty (77%) special programs documented having structured courses and follow-up of nonattending students with developmental disabilities.

Table 4

Program Components for Developmentally Disabled Students

Program Components (n = 26)	Yes		No	
	F	%	F	%
Mandatory assessment/ placement upon entry	19	73	7	27
Structured courses/ student follow-up	20	77	6	23
Award credit	6	23	20	77
Use of peer tutors	6	23	20	77
Use of volunteer instructors	5	19	21	81
Monitor student behaviors	21	81	5	19
Interfacing with subsequent courses	8	31	18	69
Inservice training:				
Faculty	7	27	19	73
Staff	9	35	17	65

It was surprising to note that only six (23%) of the colleges awarded credit for developmental courses that were taken on the college campus. The use of peer tutors by six

programs (23%) and volunteer instructors indicated by five colleges (19%) were also noted as surprisingly low for developmental programs. However, a majority of the programs, twenty-one (81%), monitored student behaviors frequently to assist in a positive college experience.

Only a few of the institutions, eight colleges (31%), interfaced developmental courses with subsequent courses in the institution. Likewise, a small number of faculty serving the developmentally disabled adult provided inservice training to "regular" faculty and staff to increase awareness of this special college student. This survey indicated that only seven programs (27%) conducted inservice training for "regular" faculty, and nine programs (35%) provided inservice training for "regular" staff.

Student Services

One purpose of the study was to identify current services for students with developmental disabilities at the California Community Colleges. The data shown in Table 5 indicate that the most widely used services by the colleges in their programs for students with developmental disabilities were special classes offered at twenty-five (96%) of the colleges and counseling provided by twenty-three (88%) of the special programs for these students. Assessment and physical education were two services offered at twenty-two (85%) of the colleges as an on-campus service. Social skills training was provided as an integral part of

the special developmental education program at twenty (77%) of the community colleges as well as independent living skills which were provided at nineteen (73%) of the programs.

Thirteen (50%) of the colleges offered tutoring services for students with developmental disabilities. Alternative test-taking services noted to be critical for student success in mainstreamed classes was provided at only twelve (46%) of the programs surveyed. Financial aid was available only to students with developmental disabilities at eleven (42%) of the institutions surveyed. Note taking was offered at ten (38%) colleges, and only for those students mainstreamed into "regular" classes. Transportation was available at only seven (27%) colleges.

Personal and more focused services can be used to enhance a developmentally disabled student's college participation. These specialized services were used at nine (35%) colleges and were listed under the heading "other." They are widely varied and only two services, job training and job placement, appeared several times. The other services indicated were listed only once and were noted as follows: (1) equestrian therapy, (2) driver's education, (3) art therapy, (4) mobility education, (5) developmentally disabled learner motor skills, (6) expressive skills for the developmentally disabled adults (theatre), (7) human sexuality, and (8) special classes related to substance use/abuse.

Table 5

Student Services

Current Student Services (n = 26)	Yes		No	
	F	%	F	%
Counseling	23	88	2	12
Assessment	22	85	4	15
Special classes	25	96	1	4
Transportation	7	27	19	73
Tutoring	13	50	13	50
Note taking	10	38	16	62
Physical education	22	85	4	15
Independent living skills	19	73	7	27
Financial aid	11	41	15	58
Alternative test-taking service	12	46	14	54
Social skills training	20	77	6	23
Other	9	35	17	65

Institutional Research

Analysis of the information provided by the respondents (as shown in Table 6) indicated that of the twenty-six established programs for students with developmental disabilities in the California Community Colleges were widely varied with respect to student enrollment. Programs ranged in size from current

enrollments of thirteen students to over 1,200 students. Twenty-three percent of the institutions surveyed with established programs had a current enrollment of under twenty-four developmentally disabled students. Fifteen percent of the colleges' programs for developmentally disabled students were currently serving between twenty-five and forty-nine students. Additionally, another fifteen percent of the institutions were currently serving between 200 and 224 students. Approximately sixteen percent of the colleges were currently serving over 300 students with developmental disabilities.

Approximately one-half of the colleges reported the average length of stay for students with developmental disabilities to be between one and two years. It is important to note, however, that a significant number of programs reported that two years was the maximum length of stay for developmentally disabled students in their special programs. Approximately thirty-five percent of the colleges surveyed reported serving developmentally disabled students five or more years as shown in Table 7.

Table 6

Student Enrollment

Current Enrollment	F	%
1 - 24	6	23
25 - 49	4	15
50 - 74	2	8
75 - 99	1	4
100 - 124	0	0
125 - 149	2	8
150 - 174	0	0
175 - 199	3	11
200 - 224	4	15
224 - 249	0	0
250 - 274	0	0
275 - 299	1	4
300 - 499	0	0
500 - 699	1	4
700 - 899	1	4
More than 900	1	4
Total (n = 26)	26	100

Table 7

Average Length of Program Participation

Years of Participation	F	%
1	4	15.38
2	10	38.52
3	2	7.69
4	1	3.84
5	2	7.69
6	1	3.84
7	2	7.69
8	2	7.69
9	1	3.84
10+	1	3.84
Total (n = 26)	26	100.00

Program evaluation has always been cited as a critical component determining the effectiveness of services provided. Therefore, it is not surprising to note that sixty-eight percent of the colleges surveyed have conducted a formal evaluation of their program and services. Twenty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they had never evaluated their programs and services and the remaining six percent were uncertain (see Table 8).

Table 8

Program Evaluation

Item (n = 26)	F	%
Yes	18	68
No	7	26
Uncertain	2	6

Grants and other funding sources are available to work specifically with university/college affiliated facilities to assist these institutions in administering and operating programs providing services to persons with developmental disabilities. The funding sources utilized by the programs in the California Community College system were widely varied. The two most frequently noted sources of funding were listed as Assembly Bill 77 (AB77) excess cost funds and Average Daily Attendance (ADA) reimbursements, respectively. Other sources of funding noted that were utilized by special programs for the primary purpose of providing services to students with developmental disabilities were: Lanterman funds, space donation by community agencies, categorical funding, Vocational Education Act (VEA) funds, Title V funding, regional center funding, adult education funds, district funds, and Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S) state allocations.

Educational Impact

It was evident that the majority of the California Community Colleges providing programs and services to students with developmental disabilities have benefited from providing these services. The educational impact cited by many institutions was that of an increased awareness of the developmentally disabled student as a capable learner and an appropriate participant in college activities. It was also noted that the on-campus developmental programs have been a catalyst resulting in more services available to students with developmental disabilities each year. Additionally, the California Community Colleges' governing boards, administrators, and "regular" faculty are progressively becoming more open to increasing services for this student population. However, at present some institutions are still uncertain with regard to awarding college credit for developmental courses.

Many colleges noted that once "regular" faculty and staff began to have daily contact with the developmentally disabled students, the impact the students had on the faculty and staff was profound. A consciousness-raising occurred on the part of the "regular" faculty and staff that was noted to be remarkable and rewarding. Numerous respondents noted that "regular" faculty were very skeptical of initially providing services for this student population. However, after interacting with these students over a period

of time, they were pleasantly surprised by the progress made by the developmentally disabled student. This provided a more cohesive faculty and the impetus to broaden the developmentally disabled programs. Only a few respondents reported that their "special students" did not make an educational impact on their institution, and developmental programs and services were seen as an unnecessary service.

In summation, the basic philosophy was one of acceptance for developmentally disabled adults as community college students for those institutions surveyed with established programs. Most programs expressed that "exceptionality" is incidental when contrasted with human potential. It was further recognized that many students may require specially designed programs and extra supportive services to accomplish their educational objectives and that the delivery of those services was considered to be of primary importance. Therefore, in serving this special student population, the community colleges are addressing the needs of the entire community.

Chapter 5

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Interpretation of Results

The purposes of this study were to: (1) determine the California Community Colleges' policies on serving the developmentally disabled adults; (2) determine what programs and related services are offered for the developmentally disabled adult at the California Community Colleges; (3) identify what criteria are utilized by special education/ handicapped services offices for determining eligibility for their program(s) and identify the federal and state statutes regulating the community colleges serving the developmentally disabled adult; and (4) develop a series of policies, guidelines, educational services, and related services for the developmentally disabled learner at Oxnard College and a plan for implementing and evaluating the program.

Current Institutional Information

The findings were that twenty-six (25%) of the 106 California Community Colleges had established on-campus programs for students with developmental disabilities.

Furthermore, only one of the twenty-six institutions with established programs had been in operation for over thirty years. The average number of years of operation for programs serving the developmentally disabled student was eleven years. Strong administrative support was noted at twenty-two of the institutions.

Program Components

Mandatory assessment and program placement were provided in over seventy percent of the colleges for students with developmental disabilities, as well as follow-up of nonattending students participating in the program. Less than twenty-five percent of the colleges awarded credit for developmental courses that were taken on campus. Additionally, few colleges interfaced developmental courses with subsequent courses in the institution or used volunteer teachers and/or peer tutors. Likewise, a small number of faculty serving the developmentally disabled adult provided inservice training to "regular" faculty and staff. However, a majority of the program directors felt it was essential to monitor student behaviors frequently to assist in offering students a more positive college experience.

Student Services

The most widely utilized services by the colleges in their programs for students with developmental disabilities included special classes, counseling, and physical education. It was not surprising to also note assessment as

a widely utilized service when it had been documented to be mandatory for this population at seventy-three percent of the colleges in this study. Additionally, social skills training was provided by seventy-seven percent of the programs, which is a critical element for "success" with this student population prior to mainstreaming.

Institutional Research

The range in student enrollment among the programs surveyed was most surprising and current enrollments were noted from thirteen students to over 1,200 students. Approximately one-half of the colleges reported the average length of stay for students with developmental disabilities to be between one and two years. However, a significant number of programs limit the stay of the developmentally disabled student to two years of participation in their program. It is highly questionable that this type of restriction is legal. The definition of a developmental disability cites the person's need for services of a lifelong or extended duration. This, coupled with the Developmental Disabilities Bill of Rights Act (Public Law 89-527), assures that these persons receive care, treatment, and other services (including education) to enable them to achieve their maximum potential. Conversely, approximately thirty-five percent of the colleges reported providing services to this student population for five or more years.

Program evaluation has always been cited in the literature as a critical component determining the effectiveness of services provided. Thus, it was not at all surprising to note that sixty-eight percent of the colleges surveyed had conducted formal evaluations of their programs. Only a small percentage never evaluated their programs or were uncertain if they had conducted a program evaluation.

The funding sources most utilized by the colleges were Assembly Bill 77 (AB77) excess cost funds and Average Daily Attendance (ADA) requirements. There are numerous grants and funding sources available to provide funds for colleges and universities serving students with developmental disabilities and many of the colleges were tapping those resources. Additional funding sources noted were: Lanterman funds, space donations by community agencies, categorical funding, Vocational Education Act (VEA) funds, Title V funding, regional center funding, adult education funds, district funds, and DSP&S state allocations.

Educational Impact

The concern and interest about the impact or potential impact of students with developmental disabilities on the college campus was demonstrated by the high response rate of the survey questionnaires. It was evident that the majority of the California Community Colleges that had established programs were not only benefiting from serving

these students but were deeply committed to the students as well.

Commonly held myths (i.e., that developmentally disabled students were undependable, irresponsible, etc.) by faculty not serving this student population, or by the administration and governing boards of colleges, appeared to be the greatest obstacle noted in both establishing programs and/or in the provision of services. These ideas were disputed in this study by the results noted from respondents working with this special student population. Consequently, students with developmental disabilities were noted to be capable learners, responsible persons, and appropriate participants in college activities. Furthermore, the on-campus developmental activities were noted as catalysts resulting in more and more services available to these students each year in the California Community Colleges.

In summary, the discussion of serving students with developmental disabilities on the community college campuses raises many issues. Nevertheless, the argument that the community college is the wrong place for these individuals simply defies all current federal and state mandates with respect to education for handicapped individuals. Even if the laws were disregarded, it would be unconscionable to deny this special student population equal access in institutions of higher education. Adults with developmental disabilities are entitled to strive for increased independence through education as well as greater

integ ation into the community. The community college appears to be the appropriate vehicle to allow this student population to do both. It would be a great disservice to these students if the community college system failed to design and implement programs that would not only meet their needs but allow them to achieve their maximum potential as well.

Conclusions

Examination of the data led to the following conclusions:

1. Programs for students with developmental disabilities on the California Community College campuses, for the most part, are still nonexistent, with only twenty-six of the 106 colleges having established programs.
2. Not all of the colleges perceive a need to offer programs and services to students with developmental disabilities.
3. Program directors serving students with developmental disabilities concurred that developmentally disabled adults were appropriate community college students.
4. Although educating "regular" faculty and staff is a critical factor in their acceptance and willingness to work with this special college student, the special education personnel have

not been providing inservice training on a regular basis or with any consistency.

5. There are a few available resources for developing programs for this student population on community college campuses. Information is limited in directives for developing policies and guidelines, performing a needs assessment, curriculum materials, and other colleges to share strategies and informational materials. Ideally, by networking with the few available and interested colleges with on-campus programs, education for this special student population will be supported by a sound and strong educational group.

Additionally, examination of the data in this study led to the conclusions that the policies, guidelines, educational, and related services for students with developmental disabilities at Oxnard College, and the plan for implementing and evaluating a comprehensive program need to include the following:

Policies and Guidelines

1. The Oxnard College Special Education Program should be in compliance with all federal and state regulations, in addition to Title V requirements pertaining to educational services of the developmentally disabled adult.

2. Students enrolling in the program must be eighteen years of age or older.
3. Students must meet the Oxnard College students' code of conduct and be able to understand directions sufficiently in order to benefit from an education and/or vocational program.
4. Parents and/or significant others must actively support the goals of a student's participation in the program.
5. Students must be mobility trained or willing to receive such training.
6. Students must be willing to plan toward a goal of independent living that best meets their needs.
7. Students may remain in the program only as long as supportive services are necessary to the student's success and measurable progress toward identified goal(s) is being achieved.

Educational Services

Educational services as well as related services for students with developmental disabilities were drawn from a careful review of the literature. They were also drawn from an examination of the questionnaire data that were collected from the twenty-six community colleges identified as having a formal program for this student population. The specific programs and services suggested will allow persons with

special developmental needs the opportunity to advance along the developmental continuum. These services are of critical importance, because more often than not, students with developmental disabilities are grasping to get the big picture and an understanding of overall concepts. Because adults with developmental disabilities often have difficulties retaining information without constant repetition in the most basic of skills, they are perceived as not really trying. To insure successful academic- and vocational-based training on the community college campuses for these individuals, cooperation among the special education instructors, regular faculty and community-based specialists is essential.

It must be kept in mind that the purpose of higher education for these students is not necessarily to attain academic excellence in the traditional sense, but rather to develop the skills needed to make life more meaningful. To meet the varied needs of these adults in the community, a program including basic academic skills, vocational preparation, independent living skills, social skills training, physical education, and other productive activities was outlined.

Community colleges are mandated to provide these adults with appropriate educational and related services. Institutions of higher learning need to offer these adult learners a status that observes their rights and privileges as citizens in a democratic society. Through appropriate

guidance and assistance in developing their own identities these students will be able to lead full and productive lives.

Services were outlined for these non-traditional community college students:

1. Reading Classes: These classes must focus on such topics as vocational vocabulary, word recognition and survival skills. The curriculum guides should place emphasis on classroom management techniques that facilitate activities to understand concepts and activities to reach those concepts. Human interaction between teacher-student, student-student, student-experiential situation is where the true learning occurs. The curriculum should be constantly changing to meet the current needs of the student served.
2. Mathematic Classes: Emphasis in these classes must be placed on establishing a classroom environment that provides safety. This will encourage students to participate in learning activities. Students who have not experienced a sense of achievement in mathematics cannot be expected to have strong positive attitudes about the subject. A safe classroom environment will assist students in meeting needs such as investigation, exploration, and discovery in

this subject area. Learning objectives for the mathematics classes should cover topics such as: (1) problem solving, (2) calendar and time, (3) use of money, and (4) basic arithmetic.

3. Independent Living Skills: These classes should be composed of learning components pertaining to social and personal development, leisure skills, nutrition and health. Living skills such as reading bus schedules, shopping, preparing meals, and managing money must not be taken for granted with this population. Students with developmental disabilities do not always generalize skills learned in one setting to other settings in which the same skills are required.

4. Social Skills Training: This type of training is necessary because students with developmental disabilities often lack the ability to make fine distinctions socially. It is commonplace for these students to interpret idiomatic expressions literally as well as lack understanding with regard to hidden agendas, reading body language or facial expressions. Courses providing such assistance to learning disabled community college students have already been developed. However, the courses should be reframed for the developmentally disabled

student. A repetitive and reduced rate of learning is needed to apply these skills. Combining the two student disability groups in classes focusing on social skills training would not be at all appropriate. The developmentally disabled student needs to develop appropriate interpersonal relationship skills to succeed on the community college campus and in life.

5. Creative Arts Classes: These classes should include courses in ceramics, theatre arts (drama), drawing, music, art and singing. These activities are effective tools for building self-esteem and overall growth for adults with developmental disabilities. The courses also should offer a vehicle in which these students can integrate successfully into a regular college course with appropriate support services. Many different types of learning can be measured through these classes such as cognitive and psychomotor skills.
6. Specialized Physical Education: Adaptive physical education would only be necessary for those students either physically and/or socially unable to participate in the college's regular physical education classes. The specialized physical education program (adaptive physical education) should offer the same types of

courses as the regular program with an emphasis on team sports and participation in the Special Olympics.

7. Career Preparation: Courses in this area for students with developmental disabilities need to expand beyond the typical job exploration and work adjustment classes. The counselor or special education instructor should become aware of the individual strengths of each student participating in the program. Analyzing learning strengths and weaknesses determines whether the developmentally disabled student can be successful on a specific job or in a vocational training program. Possible job choices should be analyzed for specific task requirements and compared to the ability level of each participating student.
8. Vocational Training Programs: Successful vocational training programs for this student population are larger in scope than typical community college programs. The success rate of students in these programs depends upon the attention given to the students' needs in other life areas. Therefore, individual training plans should be based upon a holistic approach to service delivery. Depending upon the adult learner's particular needs, the training plan

must include provisions for medical support, individual or family counseling, leisure/ recreation activities, residential planning, civic involvement, and consumer economics. Appropriate vocational training programs for the developmentally disabled college student should include (but are not limited to) the following: (1) food service, (2) janitorial skills, (3) grounds and landscaping, (4) housekeeping, (5) residential housekeeping, (6) child care, (7) sales, (8) human care, and (9) clerical skills.

Related Services

Support services are readily available for disabled students on community college campuses. These services, however, are not always appropriate for the developmentally disabled learner. The importance of a holistic approach is again critical in regard to providing support services for this student. The services need to be individualized to meet the particular and idiosyncratic needs of the developmentally disabled student. These learners in particular have become accustomed to frustration and failure. The specialized support services in programs for the developmentally disabled learner should not only support the student, but instill a sense of personal responsibility. These services should strike a balance between providing assistance and encouraging responsibility and independence.

Appropriate support services should facilitate the integration of the developmentally disabled adult more fully into campus life. Related services shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Educational diagnostic evaluation
2. Development of an individual learning plan
3. Personal counseling and specific purpose career guidance counseling
4. Job placement and follow-up
5. Computer-assisted learning
6. Registration assistance
7. Interpreters
8. Note-takers
9. Tutors
10. Mobility aides
11. Transportation
12. Alternative test-taking
13. Specialized adaptive devices.

Plan for Program Implementation

1. The disabled students center program coordinator should consider using the information gained in this study to develop cost and budget guidelines for such a program at Oxnard College.
2. Once the above information is developed and compiled, the information should be presented

with this study to the Oxnard College disabled students advisory committee for their review.

3. Conclusions drawn from this study and the recommendations of the special education advisory committee will be presented to appropriate Oxnard College administration for consideration in program implementation.
4. Upon approval from appropriate Oxnard College administration, courses suggested under educational services in this study should be developed and presented to the Oxnard College curriculum committee for review and approval for class offerings for college credit.

Plan for Program Evaluation

Evaluation methods focusing on both program effectiveness and student progress will be utilized. A formal evaluation of the progress will be conducted one semester after it is in operation. The program evaluation will be conducted as follows:

1. The special education advisory committee will act as the evaluation team. The program will be evaluated for its cost effectiveness, educational impact, and student satisfaction with program services.
2. The cost effectiveness will be measured by conducting a cost comparison study (i.e., the

cost per student in the developmental disabilities program will be compared to the cost per student in the learning disabilities program). Educational impact will be measured by conducting a survey of "regular" Oxnard College faculty and staff, the special education faculty and staff, as well as involved community members as appropriate. Students' progress will be evaluated in one of three ways: (a) measurable academic progress, (b) measurable social progress, and/or (c) measurable vocational progress.

Implications for the Improvement of Practice

Special educators as well as so-called "regular" instructors in the community colleges could play an important part in providing educational services to students with developmental disabilities. The results of this study have the potential for the improvement in educational practice for the developmentally disabled student. If the open-door policy of the community college is to be meaningful, the professionals as well as the instructors and administrators involved in developmental education programs must become working partners integrated into the total educational process. The open door may otherwise become a revolving door.

It is important to remember that there is still a good deal of misinformation, fear, and prejudice in regard to persons with developmental disabilities. Traditional stereotypes of these individuals, especially those with mental retardation, include the image of the "eternal child."

In the end, only appropriate educational programs providing the developmentally disabled citizen with the opportunity to be adults can truly facilitate change in today's community colleges and in today's communities. The primary tasks of services for this special college student are twofold: (1) to create options for choice and (2) to equip students with appropriate skills that will allow them to assume as much responsibility for themselves as possible.

Only after this occurs can these individuals become contributing members of society. The well-being of all persons in any free society depends on the opportunity to develop their abilities in accordance with their own chosen goals. Students with developmental disabilities can only achieve their goals when they are allowed equal access to all available resources.

Based on the findings of this study, the following actions are recommended:

1. The results of the study should be shared with the appropriate administrators at Oxnard College for the purposes of implementation of a program

for students with developmental disabilities at Oxnard College.

2. The study should be used as a justification for the budget expense request to implement the program at Oxnard College.
3. The appropriate Oxnard College administration should explore additional funding sources that will assist in serving this student population.
4. The Oxnard College special education department's developmental disabilities specialist should provide an inservice training program for all Oxnard College administrators, faculty, and staff prior to the program's implementation and on an ongoing basis thereafter.

Strategies for Improvement, Implementation, and Diffusion

The results of the study will be sent to each of the participating colleges and to each member of the Oxnard College special education advisory committee. The study will also be presented to the appropriate administrators at Oxnard College for purposes of implementing services for students with developmental disabilities at the college for the spring 1989 semester. The program implementation

proposal will be submitted to the Ventura Community College District Board of Trustees to be considered for program adoption at Oxnard College.

A copy of the study will also be sent to the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse. Articles will be prepared for journals pertaining to special education, and notices of availability of the study will be sent to other professionally appropriate journals. Concerted efforts will be made to present papers at meetings of professional associations, such as California Association of Postsecondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED), community outreach programs, Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC) meetings, special education seminars, and regional and national conferences of special educators and rehabilitation professionals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

83

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackler, Eugene J., and Glenna Booth. The College for Living at Metropolitan State College, Denver Colorado: Continuing Education for Developmentally Disabled Adults, Service Learning for Degree Students and A College Response to Community Needs. ERIC ED 262 490, 1980.

Ahrendt, Kenneth M. "Teaching the Developmental Education Student." New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

Appleby, J. A. Training Programs and Placement Services. Salt Lake City, UT: Olympics Publishing, 1978.

Badham, N. "The Outside Employment of Hospitalized Mentally Defective Patients as a Step towards Resocialization." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 59:666-680, Spring, 1955.

Bellamy, G. T., R. H. Hoover, and D. P. Ignam. Vocational Habilitation of Severely Retarded Adults: A Direct Service Technology. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 1979.

Black, Jan. "Evaluation: Qualify It, Qualify It." In Eugene Ackler and Glenna Booth (Eds.), The College for Living at Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado: Continuing Education for Developmentally Disabled Adults, Service Learning for Degree Students, and a College Response to Community Needs. ERIC ED 262 490, 1980.

California Community Colleges Board of Governors. Updating Regulations for Disabled Student Programs and Services, Title V. April 16-17, 1987. (Reproduced.)

Carbone, Gilbert J. "Academic Support Services for Developmental and High-Risk Students in Community Colleges." New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

Cohen, A. M. "Responding to Criticism of Developmental Education." In Kenneth M. Ahrendt (Ed.), "Teaching the Developmental Education Student." New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

Cohen, A. M., and F. B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Congress of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. A Compilation of Federal Laws for Disabled Children, Youth and Adults. Prepared by the Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate. Ninety-ninth Congress, First Session. ERIC ED 260 541, 1985.

Decker, Rodger W. "Support and Rehabilitation Services for Severely Orthopedically Disabled College Students." In Kalisher Mallik and Elaine M. Shaver (Eds.), Unmasking Abilities Hidden by Developmental Conditions. ERIC ED 260 192, 1980.

Edgerton, B. The Cloak of Competence: Stigma in the Lives of the Mentally Retarded. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Galloway, C., and R.G. Lecours, Eds. Try Another Way. Urbana, IL: Marc Gold and Associates, Inc., 1987.

Gardner, James F., Linda Long, Roann Nichols, and Diane M. Iaguldi. Program Issues in Developmental Disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 1980.

Gelman, Sheldon R. "The Developmentally Disabled: A Social Work Challenge." In Lynn Wikler and Maryanne P. Keenan (Eds.), Developmental Disabilities, No Longer a Private Tragedy. Silver Springs, MD: National Associates of Social Workers, 1983.

Gold, Marc. "Try Another Way." In C. Galloway and R. G. Lecours (Eds.), Try Another Way. Urbana, IL: Marc Gold and Associates, Inc., 1987.

Greenleigh Associates. "The Role of the Sheltered Workshop in the Rehabilitation of the Severely Handicapped." Report of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Rehabilitation Services Administration. New York: Greenleigh Associates, 1975.

Judd, Patricia, James N. Woods, Patricia L. Young, and Rebecca Singleton. Job Satisfaction of the Developmentally Disabled Workers in Competitive Employment. ERIC ED 267 535, 1981.

Kolstoe, P. "An Examination of Some Characteristics Which Discriminate between Employed and Not-employed Mentally Retarded Males." American Journal of Deficiency, 66:472-482, Fall, 1961.

Kreps, Alice Reolofs. "Curriculum Development: Fitting the Bed to the People." In Eugene Ackler and Glenna Booth (Eds.), The College for Living at Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado: Continuing Education for Developmentally Disabled Adults, Service Learning for Degree Students, and a College Response to Community Needs. ERIC ED 262 490, 1980.

Mallik, Kalisankar, and Elaine M. Shaver. Unmasking Abilities Hidden by Developmental Conditions. ERIC ED 260 192, 1980.

Maslow, H. Toward a Psychology of Being. 2nd ed. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1968.

McGrath, Dennis, and Martin B. Spear. "The Politics of Remediation." New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

Mithaug, D. E., L. Hagimeier, and N. Haring. "The Relationship between Training Activities and Job Placement on Vocational Education of the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped." AAESPH Review, 2:89-109, June, 1977.

Noel, L., R. Levitz, and J. Kaufman. "Campus Services for Academically Underprepared Students: A Report of a National Survey." In L. Noel and R. Levitz (Eds.), How to Succeed with Academically Underprepared Students: A Catalog of Successful Practices. Ames, IA: American College Testing Program, 1982.

O'Brien, M. W. "A Vocational Study of a Group of Institutionalized Persons." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 57:56-62, Spring, 1952.

Perske, R. "Mental Retardation: The Leading Edge--Service Programs that Work." Staff Report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, Washington, D.C., 1978. (Reproduced.)

Pomerantz, D., and D. Marholin. "Vocational Habilitation: A Time for Change in Existing Service Delivery Systems.' In E. Sontag, W. Certo, and J. Smith (Eds.), Educational Programming for the Severely Handicapped. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Rinck, Christine. Standardized Assessment of the Developmentally Disabled Person. ERIC ED 276 163, 1986.

Roueche, J. E. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place." Community and Junior College Journal, 54:21-24, March, 1984.

Rusch, F. R. and R. P. Schutz. "Vocational and Social Behavior Research: An Evaluative Review." In J. L. Matson and J. E. McCartner (Eds.), Handbook of Behavioral Modification with the Mentally Retarded. New York: Plenum Press, 1981.

Schultz, R. P., K. F. Jostes, F. R. Rusch, and D. S. Lamson. "Acquisition, Transfer, and Social Validation of Two Vocational Skills in a Competitive Employment Setting." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15:306-311, May, 1980.

Stodden, R. A. Occupational Programming for the Severely Disabled Individual: The Least Restrictive Alternative. Framingham, MA: Institute Training Materials, 1980.

Stodden, Robert A., and Phyllis M. Browder. Community Based Competitive Employment Preparation of Developmentally Disabled Persons: Factors Contributing to Success. ERIC ED 261 517, 1985.

Strowbridge, Edwin D. "Mathematics and Developmental Education." In Kenneth M. Ahrendt (Ed.), Teaching the Developmental Education Student: New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

Summers, Jean A. Right to Grow Up. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 1986.

Talkington, L. W., and D. B. Overbeck. "Job Satisfaction and Performance with Retarded Females." Mental Retardation, 13:18-19, 1975.

U.S. Department of Labor. Sheltered Workshop Study: A Nationwide Report on Sheltered Workshops and Their Employment of Handicapped Individuals. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1979.

Wehman, P. H. and M. Hill. Vocational Training and Placement of Severely Disabled Persons. Vol. 2. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1980.

Wolfensberger, W. Normalization: The Principle of Normalization in Human Services. Toronto, Canada: Nationwide Institute on Mental Retardation, 1972.

Woods, James N., Patricia L. Young, Paul L. Jones and Rebecca Singleton. Attitudinal Change of Direct Service Providers toward Competitive Employment for Persons with Developmental Disabilities. ERIC ED 266 611, 1985.

Young, Bonnie J., and Bonnie L. Staebler. "Learning Disabilities and the Developmental Education Program," New Directions for Community Colleges, 57:15, Spring, 1987.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THE COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT IMPLEMENTATION SCALE

COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT IMPLEMENTATION SCALE

Directions: Answer "yes" or "no" to each item below by placing a check mark in the appropriate space.

My duties during the last 12 months have included:	Yes	No
1. Assessing local businesses for entry-level jobs	___	___
2. Determining the client's chances for employment	___	___
3. Writing observations of clients in the work setting	___	___
4. Analyzing production tasks for clients	___	___
5. Analyzing competitive employment tasks for clients	___	___
6. Working with clients to develop social skills for competitive employment	___	___
7. Working with clients to develop social skills for independent living	___	___
8. Routinely contacting businesses concerning employment of clients	___	___
9. Teaching work habits and production skills	___	___
10. Teaching skills for specific jobs in the community	___	___
11. Following up clients in person at the job site	___	___
12. Following up clients by phone to employer at job site	___	___

My duties during the last 12 months have included:	Yes	No
13. Determining if client placements are successful	___	___
14. Having specific job placement duties as part of my job	___	___
15. Having specific job development duties as part of my job	___	___
16. Placing a client in competitive employment	___	___

APPENDIX B

RINCK SELF-REPORT ASSESSMENT SCALES

RINCK SELF-REPORT ASSESSMENT SCALES

General Life Satisfaction
Pre-Assessment

Part I

1. How do you feel when you go to a party and have a good time?

2. How would you feel if you lost a good friend?

3. What do you like to eat best? How would you feel if you had lots of _____ (name of food they like to eat)?

4. How would you feel if you fell down and broke your leg?

In order to "pass" the pretest, an individual must comprehend 3 of the 4 questions.

Part II

1. How happy are you about the friends you have?

2. How happy are you about the people you live with?

3. How happy are you about what you do in your free time? (when you are not working)

4. How happy are you about what you do during the day?

5. How happy are you about the time you are away from where you live? (like eating out, going to movies, or ball games)

6. How happy are you about the amount of money you have to spend?

7. How happy are you about (name of main program activity)?

8. How happy are you about the place where you live?

9. When you think about yourself over the past few weeks, how do you feel?

The responses to the above questions are:

(a) None of the time
(b) Some of the time
(c) Lots of the time
(d) All of the time

Self-Report Assessment Scale (General Life Satisfaction and Leisure Activity Levels)

1. Do you visit with other people where you live?

2. Do you plan games with other people?

3. Do you spend time in your room by yourself?

4. Do you visit with people who do not live in your building?

5. Do you go to stores and shops?

6. Do you talk to people?

7. Do you telephone friends?

8. Do you go out to eat with other people?

9. Are you bored, that is, do you feel like there is nothing interesting to do or nothing that you want to do?

10. Do you go out and do things with other people like go to the movies?

11. Do friends call you on the telephone?

12. Do you visit with relatives?

13. Do you like to be by yourself?

14. Do you take small trips to places like parks, zoos, or ball games?

15. What did you do yesterday?

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

STUDY PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

College	Community College District
Alameda, College of	Peralta CCD
Allan Hancock College	Allan Hancock Joint CCD
American River College	Los Rios CCD
Bakersfield College	Kern CCD
Barstow College	Kern CCD
Butte College	Butte CCD
Cabrillo College	Cabrillo CCD
Canada College	San Mateo County CCD
Canyons, College of the	Santa Clarita CCD
Cerritos College	Cerritos CCD
Cerro Cosa Community College	Kern CCD
Chabot College	South County CCD
Chaffey College	Chaffey CCD
Citrus College	Citrus CCD
Coastline Community College	Coast CCD
Columbia College	Yosemite CCD
Compton Community College	Compton CCD
Contra Costa Community College	Contra Costa CCD
Cosumnes River College	Los Rios CCD
Crafton Hills College	San Bernardino CCD
Cuesta College	San Luis Obispo CCD
Cuyamaca College	Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
Cypress College	North Orange County CCD
De Anza College	Foothill-De Anza CCD
Desert, College of the	Coachella Valley CCD
Diablo Valley College	Contra Costa CCD
East Los Angeles College	Los Angeles CCD
El Camino College	El Camino CCD
Evergreen Valley College	San Jose CCD
Feather River College	Peralta CCD
Foothill College	Foothill-De Anza CCD
Fresno City College	State Center CCD
Fullerton College	North Orange County CCD
Gavilan College	Gavilan Joint CCD
Glendale Community College	Glendale CCD
Golden West College	Coast CCD
Grossmont College	Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
Hartnell College	Hartnell CCD
Imperial Valley College	Imperial CCD
Irvine Valley College	Saddleback Valley CCD

College	Community College District
Kings River Community College	State Center CCD
Lake Tahoe Community College	Lake Tahoe CCD
Laney College	Peralta CCD
Lassen College	Lassen CCD
Long Beach Community College	Long Beach CCD
Los Angeles City College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Harbor College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Mission College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Pierce College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Southwest College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Angeles Valley College	Los Angeles CCD
Los Medanos College	Contra Costa CCD
Marin Community College	Marin CCD
Mendocino College	Mendocino-Lake CCD
Merced College	Merced CCD
Merritt College	Peralta CCD
MiraCosta College	MiraCosta CCD
Mission College	West Valley Joint CCD
Modesto Junior College	Yosemite CCD
Monterey Peninsula College	Monterey Peninsula CCD
Moorpark College	Ventura County CCD
Mt. San Antonio College	Mt. San Antonio CCD
Mt. San Jacinto College	Mt. San Jacinto CCD
Napa Valley College	Napa Valley CCD
Ohlone College	Fremont-Neward CCD
Orange Coast College	Coast CCD
Oxnard College	Ventura County CCD
Palomar College	Palomar CCD
Palo Verde College	Palo Verde CCD
Pasadena City College	Pasadena Area CCD
Porterville College	Kern CCD
Rancho Santiago College	Rancho Santiago CCD
Redwoods, College of the	Redwoods CCD
Rio Hondo College	Rio Hondo CCD
Riverside City College	Riverside CCD
Sacramento City College	Los Rios CCD
Saddleback College	Saddleback CCD
San Bernardino Valley College	San Bernardino CCD
San Diego City College	San Diego CCD
San Diego Mesa College	San Diego CCD
San Diego Miramar College	San Diego CCD
San Francisco, City College of	San Francisco CCD
San Francisco CC Centers	San Francisco CCD
San Joaquin Delta College	San Joaquin Delta CCD
San Jose City College	San Jose CCD
San Mateo, College of	San Mateo County CCD

College	Community College District
Santa Barbara City College	Santa Barbara CCD
Santa Monica College	Santa Monica CCD
Santa Rosa Junior College	Sonoma County Junior CCD
Sequoias, College of the	College of the Sequoias CCD
Shasta College	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint CCD
Sierra College	Sierra Joint CCD
Siskiyou, College of the	Siskiyou Joint CCD
Skyline College	San Mateo County CCD
Solano Community College	Solano County CCD
Southwestern College	Southwestern CCD
Taft College	West Kern CCD
Ventura College	Ventura County CCD
Victor Valley Community College	Victor Valley CCD
Vista College	Peralta CCD
West Hills College	West Hills CCD
West Los Angeles College	Los Angeles CCD
West Valley College	West Valley Joint CCD
Yuba College	Yuba CCD

APPENDIX D

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED PROGRAM

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Institutional Information

1. Name of institution: _____

2. Name of person completing survey: _____

3. Does your institution have established policies, guidelines, and program for serving the developmentally disabled (DD) student? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

   If your institution has the above established program, please complete the remaining portion of this questionnaire.

   If your institution does not have this established program, please complete questions 1 to 3 and return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

4. How long has your institution had a program for DD students?

   _____years

5. Does your institution have strong administrative support for this program? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

6. Does your institution have mandatory assessment and placement upon entry? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

7. Does your institution have structured courses and follow-up of nonattenders? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

8. Does your institution award credit for developmental courses? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

9. Does your institution provide extensive use of peer tutors for DD students? (circle one)

   (a) Yes (b) No

10. Does your institution use only volunteer instructors in developmental courses? (circle one)

    (a) Yes (b) No

11. Does your institution provide frequent monitoring of student behaviors? (circle one)

    (a) Yes (b) No

12. Does your institution provide interfacing with subsequent courses? (circle one)

    (a) Yes -- If yes, list course and course number:

    _____

    (b) No

13. Does your institution provide inservice training for "regular" faculty and staff? (check appropriate spaces)

    (a) Faculty: _____Yes _____No

    (b) Staff: _____Yes _____No

14. What current services does your institution offer for DD students? (check appropriate spaces)

(a) Counseling:	___Yes	___No
(b) Assessment:	___Yes	___No
(c) Special classes:	___Yes	___No
(d) Transportation:	___Yes	___No
(e) Tutoring:	___Yes	___No
(f) Note-taking:	___Yes	___No
(g) Physical education:	___Yes	___No
(h) Independent living skills:	___Yes	___No
(i) Financial aid:	___Yes	___No
(j) Alternative test-taking services:	___Yes	___No
(k) Social skills training:	___Yes	___No

(l) Other (Please list):

_____

_____

Institutional Research

15. What is the number of DD students currently enrolled in your institution?

    (a) _____males (b) _____ females

16. What is the DD student's average length of stay in the program?

    _____years _____months

17. Has your institution conducted an evaluation of the program? (circle one)

    (a) Yes (b) No

18. What is the funding source for your DD program for the 1987-88 school year? (please list)

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

19. What has been the educational impact of your DD program at your institution?

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

20. Comments from the institution:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

Please send questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Joan Jones, M.S.
Counselor, Special Education Office
Oxnard College
4000 South Rose Avenue
Oxnard, California 93033

APPENDIX E

TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED PROGRAM

TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Institutional Information

1. Name of institution: _____

2. Name of contact person: _____

Program Information

3. Describe your DD student initial interview/assessment process:

_____
_____
_____
_____

4. Are multiple learning systems utilized with the DD students? (circle one)

(a) Yes (b) No

If yes, please describe:

_____
_____
_____
_____

5. What are the flexible completion components for your DD program?

_____
_____
_____
_____

6. What criteria are utilized in mainstreaming DD students at your institution?

_____
_____
_____
_____

7. What types of inservice training programs do you offer for "regular" faculty and staff?

_____
_____
_____
_____

8. Comments for the institution?

_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Request the institution to send a copy of their developmentally disabled program's policies, guidelines, outline of current curriculum, and student and program evaluation outlines.

10. Provide instructions for mailing materials.

PLEASE MAIL AVAILABLE MATERIALS TO:

Joan Jones, M.S.
Counselor, Special Education Office
Oxnard College
4000 South Rose Avenue
Oxnard, California 93033

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOAN JONES

Joan Jones is the Assessment Facilitator for Oxnard College as well as the Counselor for the college's handicapped services program. She also is a special education instructor teaching a wide variety of personal growth classes, career counseling classes, and specialized classes for students with developmental disabilities. Oxnard College is in a three-college district serving the County of Ventura, California. She has held the facilitator position for two years and has been at the college for over seven years as a counselor and instructor. Prior to her position at Oxnard College, she served as the Director of Vocational Services for four years at Northridge Hospital Medical Center. In addition to these full-time appointments, she has worked as a Rehabilitation Counselor and Consultant in private practice. Joan has also served on numerous advisory committees in the area of higher education, special education, and rehabilitation.

She earned a bachelor of science degree at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point and a master of science degree at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. She holds California Community Colleges' credentials as a counselor, developmentally disabled specialist, and physical disabilities specialist. She has made numerous

presentations to community college personnel, vocational rehabilitation experts, counselors, and other audiences on such topics as vocational assessment and testing, career counseling, career training for exceptional populations, and career advancement in the workplace.

Publications include documents that will be available through the U.S. Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) as of the summer and fall of 1988: (1) Identification of Topics for a Faculty Resource Guide for Adaptive Testing of Students with Disabilities, (2) The Implementation of Inservice Trainings on the Control of Burnout for Special Education Professionals, (3) Identification of Sources of Referral for Learning Disabled Students at Oxnard College with Implications for Improving Service, and (4) Comparison of Test Anxiety Levels between Assessment Center Students Who Participated in Assessment Orientations and Those Who Have Not.